Mr. SPEAKER.—Please continue the debate. Please try to be brief. The whole thing has to be over within 45 minutes. Members are sending in requisitions for participation in debate but I do not know whether they are serious or not. If they are serious they do not get ready when time is available.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—Sir, yesterday you requested the Government to make a statement regarding free water supply.

Mr. SPEAKER.—They will do it. I believe the Chief Minister is away. He is not here today. Therefore we must wait for Monday till he comes.

MYSORE SECONDARY EDUCATION EXAMINATION BOARD BILL 1966

(as reported by the Joint Select Committee)

Motion to consider—(Contd.).

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರೇ, ಸೆಕೆಂಡರಿ ಎಜುಕೇಷನ್ ಎಗ್ಸಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಮಸೂದೆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾದಾಗ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆ ಅನೇಕ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದಂತಹ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಅಂಶ—ಎಗ್ಸಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಯಾಚುಟರಿ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಏನು ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೋ ಆ ಒಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ನೆರವೇರಲೆಂದು. ಅದು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇವತ್ತು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಎಸ್.ಎಸ್.ಎಲ್.ಸಿ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಸೂದೆ ಇದು ವರೆಗೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಏನು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ ಯೆಂದರೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳ ಮಾರಾಟ ಪೇಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಳ ಗುಟ್ಟು ಹೊರಗೆಡಹುತ್ತಿದೆಂಬ ಸಂತೆಯವನ್ನು ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂತಹ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವತ್ತು ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ರೀತಿನೀತಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇದರ ಮುಖ್ಯೋದ್ದೇಶ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಸಾಧನೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಯಾವ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ರಚನೆಯಾವರೂ ಅದು ಕಾರ್ಯನಮಿತಿ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕು. ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ 37 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಏನು ಕೆಲಸ ಸಾಧನೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಅದು ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ! ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಮಿತಿ ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡದು, ಇದನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆಮಾಡಿ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡದೆ ಏನೂ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡದೆಯೇ ಪುನಃ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದು ಬಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಅಷ್ಟು ಯಶಸ್ವಿಯಾಗದು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗಿ 37 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರೇ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಮೊದಲಿಯಾರ್ ಅಂತಹವರ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇವಲ ೫ ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ತಜ್ಞರು ವಿಚಾರ ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವಂತಹ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಇವರು ನಿರಾಕರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪಠ್ಯ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡುವುದು, ವಿದ್ಯಾ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಅಂದರೆ ಪಠ್ಯ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅಳವಡಿಸುವ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಪಠ್ಯ ಕ್ರಮಗಳ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ)

ಈಗ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ಯಾ್ಯಚ್ಯುಟರಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಏನಿದೆ ಇದು ಸ್ಯಾ್ಯಚ್ಯುಟರಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ನಮೂನೆಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾದ ಸ್ಯಾ್ಯಚ್ಯುಟರಿ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಈ ಮನೋಧೆಯನ್ನು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇದೆ ? ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ವನ್ನೆರ್ಲಾ ಒಬ್ಬ ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಅವರ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಪ್ಪೊತ್ತು ಎಗ್ಸಿಕ್ಯುಟೀವ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಗ್ಜಾಮಿನರು ಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟುವುಗಳು.

I invite the attention of the Hon'ble Minister for Education to Clause 15—Powers and duties of the Board. Sub-clause (*d*) says :

"to appoint Examiners and Supervisors..."

Clause 21 (4) says ,

"The Chairman shall make appointments of Examiners out of the panel drawn up by the Examiners' Committee"

This is high-handedness. That Committee prepares the panel of examiners.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The Chairman has no power independently. The Committee of Examiners draws up the panel of names of Examiners, and the Chairman appoints the examiners out of the panel. The power of appointing examiners has been given to him. Out of a long list of 20-25 persons drawn, naturally some may be willing and some may not be willing. He chooses those who are willing.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Now that power vests with the Board. The powers of the Board are very well defined to appoint examiners. How can you delegate the powers to the Chairman ?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—That power of the Board is delegated to the Chairman by a Resolution saying that he can choose out of the panel prepared by the Committee of Examiners.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Then, what is the use of having this Board ? Why should you have a Board ? He can as well carry out the entire thing. I was a member of the University Panel Committee. It is the Board that should agree. The Chairman by whims and fancies can choose the Examiners. The entire spirit of the Bill is lost by giving powers to the Chairman. Further, sub-clause (5) of Clause 21 says :

"The Chairman may in an emergency appoint any Examiner outside the panels drawn up by the Examiners' Committee...".

This is an extraordinary power given to the Chairman. He can appoint anybody he likes. The very spirit and the purpose of the Bill is lost by giving this extraordinary power. If you do not remove the powers of the Chairman and entrust them to the Board, this Bill will become a scrap of paper. I ask the Hon'ble Minister for Education that if this power is not given to the Board, what is the use of having this Bill ? He can as well be the Controller of Examinations and the Examiners' Committee to draw up the panel. Even now, the Director

is the ex-officio Chairman and you have lent his services. Indirectly, in the name of the Board, the same Government machinery is working and the same Director is functioning under the guise of the Statutory Body. This is more dangerous. At least, if he is a Government servant, there will be some check. Now he is absolutely made a dictator.

Regarding the finances, you say that this is a Statutory Body. A statutory Body should have at least the freedom to make financial estimates. Of course, the idea that the expenditure and the audited statement should be submitted to the Legislature is good. Sub-clause (2) of clause 25 says :

> "The Board shall prepare, before such date as may be prescribed, the financial estimates for the ensuing year and forward them to the State Government for its sanction....."

Then, what is the autonomy given to the Examinations Board ? It is just like a Government Department. The very purpose and the very roots of autonomy are taken way by this section. Like that the Bill has got some anomalies, by which the purpose and the objectives of this Bill are taken away.

ಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರೇ, ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಅಣ್ಣಾರಾವ್ ಗಣಮುಖಿಯವರು ಅನೇಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸಾಗತಾರ್ಹವಾಗಿವೆ. ಏತಕ್ಕೆಂದರೆ, ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಸಾಧನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದು ನರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಆಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳು, ಕರಿಕ್ಯುಲಮ್ ಆಫ್ ಸ್ಟಡೀಸ್ ಇವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕೆಲಸ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ನಿರ್ವಿವಾದವಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ಇದನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಸಚಿವರು ಏನು ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಸಾಧನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಅದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಆಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸೆಕೆಂಡರಿ ಎಜುಕೇಷನ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದರ ಅಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸಾಧನೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ, ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿ ಬೇರೆ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾಸ್‌ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ತಮಗೆ ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟಹಾಗೆ 2-3 ಅಫಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದರೆ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸಾಧನೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಇದನ್ನು ನರಿಪಡಿಸಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri P. F. D'MELLOW (Nominated).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall confine myself to just one Clause 39—Removal of difficulties. Even at this stage, I wish to draw the attention of the Hon'ble Minister for Education to one such difficulty which I envisaged right from the commencement, even before the Bill came up here. The few remarks I am making are meant entirely in the interest of retaining whatever remains of student discipline in the State and I plead with him on behalf of the students, not the managements. I ask him to be kind enough to take into consideration the effect of the abolition of any examination, which is at present held and for which the students are at the moment preparing. I am sure the Minister will accept it without a question. I draw his attention to the recent order of the Government which was issued after the introduction of this Bill and which has

(SRI P. F. D'MELLOW)

abolished one such Examination Board, the Anglo-Indian Secondary School Examinations Boards.

Let me make it clear that I welcome the step that Government has taken; let there be no doubt about it. I welcome the decision of the Government to abolish this duel S.S.L.C. Sir, I had the privilege to speak on the 23rd of last month and on that occasion I said that in abolishing any examination due regard must be paid to the effect on those students who are now preparing for the examinations. It is not a case of just a few hundreds. It a question of something like 4 to 5,000 students who are really affected, not immediately but over the next two years. To that extent I would plead: do not let student indiscipline which we have kept away from the schools spreading. I request the Minister to consider this aspect and see that nothing happens to affect the students who are at the moment preparing for the Anglo-Indian Certificate Examination. Sir, I had the privilege to meet several Heads of the schools and I learnt to my dismay that a certain order abolishing certain Boards have been issued. I therefore appeal on their behalf and draw the attention of the Government to at least allow this examination to be undertaken by the new Board with such modifications that Government may deem wise but not to abolish it over-night. As I represented last time here, our schools have been the very picture of good discipline for years. By a sudden change which will affect them who are preparing for the last three years for this examination, I fear what the consequences would be. I say, it is not the question of just the number. I believe, the Hon'ble Minister will agree that as a parent, as a Minister, even if there is one child whose discipline we want to retain, it would be worth that consideration is given to ensure that nothing is done to depress the student. I would propose the Hon'ble Minister considering calling immediately a meeting of the Heads of the Schools which will be affected and to hear from them practical suggestions what can be made. I have always stood for the policy that the Minister is implementing. I have always stood for the freedom of a parent to send his child to such examinations as he desires. I have never stood for riding two horses at the same time. But, unfortunately, there are some whose livelihood will depend on this examination. Take it away by all means but I beg you to take it away after giving reasonable opportunity to the students who are now preparing themselves for these examinations. Thank you, Sir.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ್.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿವರ್ಷ ಎಸ್. ಎಸ್. ಎಲ್. ಸಿ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಕೂಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಮಿತಿಮೀರುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ನಡಳತೆಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ತೆರನಾದ ಎಜ್ಯುಕೇಷನ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಬಿಲ್‌ನ್ನು ತಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಒಂದೆರಡು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಪೇಕ್ಷೆಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈಗ ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ವರ್ಷದ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಎಸ್. ಎಸ್. ಎಲ್. ಸಿ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಕೂಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಕೂಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೀ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಒಂದೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಏರ್ಪಾಡುಗಳು ಇವೆ.

ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಇವತ್ತು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಸ್ಥಳಾವಕಾಶ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಆಫ್ ದಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ, 41 ಮಂದಿ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಅವರ ಗ್ರೇಡಿನವರು ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಆಗಿರಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಆಫ್ ದಿ ಸೆಕೆಂಡರಿ ಎಜ್ಯುಕೇಷನ್ ಇನ್ ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಇದ್ದವರು ವೈಸ್ ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಆಗಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಇದೆ. ನನ್ನ ಒಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಇರುವವರು ಡಿ.ಪಿ.ಐ. ಗ್ರೇಡ್‌ನವರು ಇರಬೇಕು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸೆಕೆಂಡರಿ ಎಜ್ಯುಕೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕತಕ್ಕ ಗ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ಆಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಇತರ ಅನುಕೂಲತೆಗಳನ್ನಾಗಲೀ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಡಿ.ಪಿ.ಐ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಷಿಪ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇಬ್ಬರು ಡಿವಿಜನಲ್ ಡೆಪ್ಯೂಟಿ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ಸ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್ ಅಫಿಷಿಯೋ ಮೆಂಬರ್ಸ್ ಆಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಇದು ಸಮಂಜಸವಲ್ಲ. 40 ಮಂದಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಇಷ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಣ್ಣದು ಮಾಡಿ 20-21 ಮಂದಿ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಎಕ್ಸಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿ ಒಂದು ಎಕ್ಸಾಮಿನರ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ 21 ಮಂದಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವೆಲ್ಲ ಅಲ್ಲದೇ ಅದರ್ ಕಮೀಟೀಸ್ ಅಂತ ಬೇರೆ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನವರು ತಮಗೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕಂಡ ನಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇತರ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡ ಬಹುದು. ಎಕ್ಸಾಮಿನರ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡದಾಗಿ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ವಾಗದೇ ದೂರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗಿ, ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ರೀತಿಯ ತರಾವುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಠಿಣ ವಾದ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಬರುವುದರಿಂದ 7 ಮಂದಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ, ಉಳಿದ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಗಳ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಎಕ್ಸಾಮಿನರ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳ ಮಿತಿ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಚೇರ್ಮನ್‌ರವರ ಅವಧಿ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷ ಇರುವಾಗ ಪ್ರತಿವರ್ಷ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಕ್ಸಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸುವ್ಯವಸ್ಥಿತವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವರ್ಷ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಕಠಿಣ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷ ನರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದ ರಿಂದ ಎಕ್ಸಾಮಿನರ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷದ ಅವಧಿ ಮುಗಿಯುವವರೆಗೂ ಮಾರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇವಲ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅಳವಡಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೊಸ್ಕರ ಇಷ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಬೃಹತ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾ ಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಸೆಕೆಂಡರಿ ಎಜ್ಯುಕೇಷನ್ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಎಲ್ಲ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಗಳನ್ನೂ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಮುಖಾಂತರವೇ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಮೇಯ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇತ್ತು. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುವಾಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಡಿ.ಪಿ.ಐ. ರವರ ಗ್ರೇಡ್‌ನವರನ್ನು ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಆಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಪವರ್ಸನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಡೆಲಿಗೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಗ್ಯಾಂಟೂ ಕೂಡ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಶಾರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಶಾರೆಗಳ ಮೇಲ್ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗು ತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಟೆಕ್ಸ್‌ಟ್ ಬುಕ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಇಡೀ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಏಕೀಕೃತವಾದ ಟೆಕ್ಸ್‌ಟ್ ಬುಕ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಪೂರೈಸಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗು ವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸೆಕೆಂಡರಿ ಎಜ್ಯುಕೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳನ್ನೂ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದು ಸ್ತುತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಹುಡುಗರಿಗೆ ನರ್ವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ನಹಾಯ ಸಿಕ್ಕಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇದು ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಉಳಿದ ರೀತಿಯ ನಹಾಯಗಳು ಸಿಕ್ಕದಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರಿ ಹೋಗಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಳವಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿನುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

10-00 A.M.

†Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I am grateful to the members who have taken part in the debate. Hon'ble members have generally welcomed this, but they have added that some more powers should be given to the Board. Some of them have argued that the curriculum of studies and syllabus should be handed over to this Board. From the beginning I

(SRI S.R. KANTHI)

have been opposed to it because it has been considered by a body of experts in this direction. The Maharashtra Board is given the power of curriculum of studies and syllabus, but only of the XIth standard and the other standards like the VIII, IX and X are with the Department. It was considered by the Government and by experts and it was found that such a procedure would involve diarchy which would not work well and so they could not agree with the suggestion made by hon'ble members. This point was also considered by the Joint Select Committee and they agreed that this Board should be a Board only to conduct the examinations. As I have said, there are a large number of examinations and most of these examinations will be handed over to this Board and then the Board will have ample work and no time will be left with them to look into other matters. Especially in the matter of curriculum, syllabus and prescribing of text books there is a lot of confusion and the Government are worried about the way in which text books are being prescribed because hon'ble members and others have complained to the Government that some of the books prescribed are not good or they contain a lot of mistakes. That being so, it is not prepared that such power should be handed over to this Board.

Then hon'ble members have argued that the personnel of the Board is too large. This point was thoroughly discussed by the Joint Select Committee and they found that it could not be reduced any further. In fact, they have reduced to some extent because formerly it was 44 and now it has come down to 41. It was not possible for the Joint Select Committee to reduce it below 41.

The other point that was rasied by my friend the Leader of the Opposition Sri Shivappa was that the budget and financial statement need not be submitted to the Government by the Board for sanction. He says that the existing provision takes away the liberty of the Board to act independently in financial matters. I would like to remind him that so many corporate bodies are being formed in our State and some of them at least are submitting budgets to the Government for sanction. For instance, the Khadi and Village Industries Board is submitting its budget annually to the Government for sanction. Similarly, the M.S.E.B. and also the M.S.R.T.C. are also doing it. This is not a new thing. Because the Government are paying out of the Consolidated Fund the Government should have an idea of the financial statement for the coming year.

The other point that was raised was why should Government pay out of the Consolidated Fund. Even in Maharashtra there is a provision like this. Those who are drawn from the Department are paid out of the Consolidated Fund and those who are appointed by the Board itself will be paid out of the funds of the Board. In this respect there are no servants of the Board who are not drawn from the Department and naturally we have to make provision that they should be paid out of the Consolidated Fund.

The other point was that the Chairman has more powers. If hon'ble members had looked into the provision more carefully they would have found the Chairman is an executive person and he draws his powers from the Board. Whatever powers are given by the Board he will have to exercise. In certain urgent cases it is not possible for the Chairman to look to the Board in an emergency and in that respect powers have been given to him to exercise them in an emergency and soon after that he has to submit the action taken by him to the Board either for ratification or for such action as the Board thinks fit.

Then my friend Sri D'Mellow raised another point. He welcomed the step taken by Government in abolishing the Anglo-Indian S.S.L.C. Board. I am glad that the hon'ble member representing the Anglo-Indian community has welcomed this measure. But what he asks is that Government should not abolish the examinations which are being held now in the Anglo-Indian schools overnight. That is not the idea of Government. I have already told him that he may come and discuss this matter so that there will be no harassment to the students going to the Anglo-Indian schools. I assure him that the Government are willing to arrive at a decision whereby the least difficulty or pain will be experienced by anybody.

The hon'ble member raised another point and that was that the students should be free to choose their own examinations. The Anglo-Indian schools are not debarred from choosing their own examinations. They can choose to appear for the examination called the Indian School Certificate Examination, but if they want to appear for the Mysore S.S.L.C. they are free to appear and there is no bar to it, but we do not want another thing called the Anglo-Indian S.S.L.C. Examination. It is an anachronism that boys should appear for this examination and also be on par with the other boys appearing for the Mysore S.S.L.C. If the boys of the Anglo-Indian schools do not want to appear for the Mysore S.S.L.C. examination, let them appear for the Indian School Certificate Examination. I am told that most of the boys and girls coming from the Anglo-Indian schools are appearing for the Anglo-Indian S.S.L.C. examination only and only 5 per cent of them are appearing for the I.S.C. Examination. It is for them to choose which examination they want. In the meanwhile if there is any difficulty for these students that difficulty can be solved to the extent possible. I think that the Anglo-Indian community and the member representing Anglo-Indian community here will help us in this respect. I assure the member that Government is very anxious to avoid any difficulty that may be experienced by these people.

Then the hon'ble member Sri Siddaiah Kashimath says that the Examiners' Committee is too large. This point also was examined by the Joint Select Committee and it was found that it is not possible to reduce the strength of this committee. At the same time the hon'ble member says that this committee should be in existence for a period of 3 years. This was also examined and it was found that in the interest of secrecy it is better that this committee should be there in existence

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

only for a year because nobody should know who is going to become the member of this committee next time. By the time people come to know that such and such a person is a member of the Committee of Examiners he will be out of that and so secrecy would be there. This is a measure which has been devised in order to maintain secrecy.

Then the hon'ble member Sri Siddaiah Kashimath further said that the power to give grants to high schools should also vest with the Board. This is unthinkable because this is such a complicated thing that the Government cannot entrust this power to the Board. When the Board indulges in such powers, naturally the examination will lose its importance and so we do not think that it should be handed over to the Board because it is not a feasible proposition.

The hon'ble member Sri Annarao raised so many points yesterday for which the Chair has already given a ruling. I only want to impress upon him one thing. All these points were raised and discussed in the Joint Select Committee and the Committee could not find its way to accept them. I once again commend the Report of the Joint Select Committee for adoption by the House.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEKER in the Chair.]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is an amendment moved by Sri Annarao Ganamukhi. I will put it to vote.

The question is:

"That the Mysore Secondary Education Examination Board Bill, 1966 as reported by the Joint Select Committee be re-committed to a New Select Committee with instructions to the Committee to make some additional provisions in the Bill, *viz.*—

(i) to lay down guiding principles for determining carricula and syllabi for entire secondary course, to approve the detailed syllabi for the final examination;

(ii) to formulate general principles for approving text books and sanction them subject to such conditions if any, as the State Board may deem fit to impose;

(iii) to change the present designation of the Bill into Secondary Education Board and enlarge its functions as envisaged in Act No. XLI of 1965; of Maharashtra;

(iv) to establish divisional Boards for every revenue or educational divisions subject to the provisions to be made under this Bill;

The amendment was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is.

"That the Mysore Secondary Education Examination Board Bill, 1966, as reported by the Joint Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

CLAUSES.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is.

"That clauses 2 to 16 both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 16 both inclusive were added to the Bill.

CLAUSES 17 TO 19.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is an amendment to clause 17 by Sri K. S. Suryanarayana Rao. He may move it. but he is not present. I will put to vote.

The question is.

"That clauses 17 to 19, both inclusive stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 17 to 19 both inclusive were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 20.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There are amendments to clause 20 by Sriyuts Annarao and Suryanarayana Rao. As they are not present, I shall put the clause to the vote.

The question is.

"That clause 20 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 20 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 21.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—As Sri Suryanarayana Rao is not present to move the amendment to clause 21, I put it to the House.

The question is.

"That clause 21 stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 21 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 22.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Sri Suryanarayana Rao is not present to move his amendment to clause 22. So, I will put it to the House.

The question is.

"That clause 22 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 22 was added to the Bill.

(MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER)

CLAUSE 23 TO 24

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is.

"That clauses 23 and 24 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 23 and 24 were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 25.

(At this stage, both Sri Suryanarayana Rao and Anna Rao Ganamukhi entered the House.)

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI (Afzalpur).—Sir, if our amendments have lapsed, it is due to the Speaker's invitation. In response to an urgent call, we have gone there and if the amendments have lapsed it is not our fault.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Whatever has been done cannot be re-opened.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore City).—The Speaker called us for certain clarifications and so we went.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Hebbur).—I rise to a point of order, Sir. Sri Anna Rao, an Hon'ble Member of this House, has tabled several amendments and when the amendments were put to the House by the Chair, the Hon'ble Member was not present because he has been invited by the Speaker for tea. Once the Speaker has invited him, it is not fair on the part of the member to refuse the invitation. It is the order of the Speaker that prevails. If they have not been able to move the amendments it was not their fault. It is the inherent right of the Speaker to revive the amendments of Sriyuths Suryanarayana Rao and Annarao Ganamukhi, and I request the Chair to take them up again.

Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—From the list furnished I find that there is a series of amendments tabled by Sriyuts Suryanarayana Rao and Annarao. You have to give them a chance to speak on their amendments. After all they did not go deliberately. Because the Speaker invited them, they went thinking that their amendments would not come up so long as they were with the Speaker.

The intention of the Members is that they went to redically change some of the clauses in order to make the Bill a perfact one. Since that be the case, the Speaker has the power to use his discretion and allow these amendments. These were important amendments and I think you have got the powers to revoke.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—In such cases the Speaker has got ample discretionary powers. The Speaker can also take the sense of the House. Therefore, I request that we may kindly be permitted to move those amendments.

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—The Hon'ble Speaker may kindly consider under what circumstances this has happened.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The point at issue is that the clauses are already adopted by the House. When they were adopted the powers either of the Chair or of the House cease unless there is any amending Bill to that effect.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—All the 24 Clauses have already been put to vote and adopted by the House, it cannot be opened at all. I sympathise with the Hon'ble Members. I do not mind personally if the entire thing is again to be opened up. But it cannot be re-opened now as per rules. There is the procedure. Though I sympathise with the Hon'ble Members, I am sorry the House cannot open it again. There are other clauses, they can be moved.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—The Chair can consider the circumstance in which we had to go to the Speaker's function. I know the whole thing has to be revised. For having taken the trouble of tabling these amendments and for having gone to the Speaker's function which cannot be refused, these amendments may be allowed to be moved.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. SPEAKER.—we cannot change the rules now. Now Clause 22. I will allow Sri Suryanarayana Rao to say whatever he wants to say. Only it will be a voice vote

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO—The House feels the importance of the amendments.—They have included something which is not needed. I would have welcomed the clause as it was. Supposing there is no amendment. You please read as it is even if my amendment is not accepted. Amendment to clause (6) has been rejected.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The Board is empowered to apoint any other Committee consisting of Members of the Board. The Committee should consist of the Members of the Board. The Board cannot appoint a Committee on which the Members of the Boardare not there.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He can express his ideas at the time of the third reading of the Bill. This is the reading of Bill clause by clause. He will have a chance of getting the vote taken; that is the difference. Otherwise there is no difference.

10-30 A.M.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—So far as this particular aspect is concerned, I want you to read this clause. If you are satisfied, the amendment is not necessary.....

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Nothing can be done because the clause has been accepted by the House.

Sri H. R. KESHVA MURTHY (Gandasi).—Exigencies of situation require elasticity of prodcedure. This is adopted in other democratic assemblies and I request you to exercise that inherent power and review the whole question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member must always try to study more. God has given him plenty of intelligence. I am happy about it. He does not state the rules. This has not arisen for the first time. If he says that every thing should be done by inherent power, I will become a dictator. That is not good for democracy. Now the point of order raised by Sri Lakkappa is that inasmuch as Sri Anna Rao Ganamukhi and Sri Suryanarayana Rao who had given notice of certain amendments had been invited by me to tea table at 10 O' clock and in response to my request they were at my Table, their absence should be viewed in a different manner and they should be permitted to move the amendments now. He is perfectly right. There is no acceptable contention in the point of order. Rules are there and they have nothing to do with the Tea Table. Rules definitely require that a Member who has given notice of an amendment should be at his seat to move it and not anywhere even inside the House. Therefore, if a Member is absent, he has to take the consequence. If I am responsible, all that I can do is to apologise to them and leave it at that. It is not a point of order. Hon'ble Sri Lakkappa seems to have queer notions or concept about point of order. A point of order should be in respect of a violation or breach of the rules. Here there is no breach of the rules. Members were absent, and therefore the amendment was not moved.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—If the Hon'ble Speaker invites us for tea, we cannot refuse. It is our love and affection to the Speaker that we have to accept his invitation. If we refuse, it shows disrespect to the Hon'ble Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There should be no longer any confusion about this matter. invitation for tea is purely a social function which does not come within the rules and if the rule is not complied with, consequences flow. There is no point of order.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—We do not want that you should apologise to us. We were staying here although invitation was on our table. But the messenger requsted us to come for tea. Meanwhile we thought that you have left instructions to the Deputy Speaker. We are sorry that those instructions were not given.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment to clause 25. The Hon'ble Member may move it.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—I move :

"That in clause 25, sub-clause (2) lines 3 and 4 the words 'for its sanction' shall be deleted.

That in sub-clause (3) line 3, between the words 'annual report' and 'giving' the words 'along with the latest audit report' shall be inserted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That in clause 25, sub-clause (2) lines 3 and 4 the words 'for its sanction' shall be deleted.

That in sub-clause (3) line 3, between the words 'annual report' and 'giving' the words 'along with the latest audit report' shall be inserted."

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—The Hon'ble Minister was stating now that in the Khadi Board as well as MSRTC, budgets are forwarded to the Government for its sanction. Ordinarily, when we create a Corporation with independent powers, their budget must be fully left to the to the descretion of the concerned body to frame its budget and spend the amount, and wherever necessary directions can be issued to those bodies. Here what is being done is even estimates for the ensuing year are sought to be forwarded to the Government for its sanction. I think Sir, this clause is against the spirit of creation of such autonomous body. The Minister mentioned Khadi Board and the MSRTC as an instance in point. Even with the power of sanction lying with the Government, what is happing in Khadi Board we are seeing today.

So, what is the necessity of calling for the Budget and giving sanction of the Government and delaying the matter? Here in Khadi Board and MSRTC, these bodies are entirely using the public money. But this body is spending the fees which are collected from the parents of the children which appear for examinations. If the Government says this is sufficient safeguard, I think the latter portion of it is clear.

The second amendment says that the Audit report also should be placed before the House. If the Audit report and the annual report comes before the House, they are placed on the Table of the House and then Sir, this House will have sufficient opportunities of discussing the affairs of the Board. When this provision is there, why the State Government should retain the power of sanctioning the Budget to itself?

Now we see that the Electricity Board has been created by the Act of Government. It is spending crores of rupees on various activities, development and other activities. Even then, the State Government does not call for any budget for sanction. Only the Annual report is placed before the Legislature for its comment. Then what is the use of calling for the Budget is my argument.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I cannot accept the amendment because when the financial statement is submitted to Government, it is for the purpose of sanction. And I have already said in some other corporations which have been the creation of this House, such a provision is there. Sir, this is a very essential one because money has got to be paid in the first instance out of the consolidated fund.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The Boards and Corporations which you are referring to, may I know whether there are any elected Members on the Khadi Board and M.S.R.T.C. ?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—It does not matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put it to the vote of the House. The question is :

"That in clause 25, at page 23, in sub-clause (2) lines 3 and 4, the words 'for its sanction' shall be deleted ;

and

" That at page 23, in sub-clause (3) line 3, between the words ' annual report ' and ' giving ' the words ' along with the latest audit report ' shall be inserted. ''

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will now put the clause. The question is :

"That clause 25 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 25 was added to the Bill,

CLAUSE 26.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Sir, I beg to move :

" That at page 24, in sub-clause (2) the following shall be added as item (*a*) and other items shall be *re-lettered* suitably :

'(*a*) prescribe the courses of study, the curricula for examination and the system and standards of Examinations ';

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

" That in clause 26, at page 24, in sub clause (2) the followings hall be added as item (*a*) and other items shall be re-lettered suitably :

'(*a*) prescribe the courses of study, the curricula for examination and the system and standard of Examinations'.

There is another amendment by Sri Anna Rao He may move it.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, I beg to move :

" That at page 24, in sub-clause (2) the following shall be added as item (a) and other items shall be re-lettered suitably :

'(*a*) subjects and curricula of examinations.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moued :

" That in clause 26, at page 24, in sub-clause (2) the following shall be added as item (*a*) and other items shall be re-lettered suitably :

' (*a*) subjects and curricula of examinations .'

Now both the clause and the amendments are before the House for discussion.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Sir, with regard to this amendment, I would like to say a few words. The Hon'ble Minister for Education while replying said that in Bombay Act, formerly it was only the Board for Examination and that worked as a sort of diarchy .....

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I did not say that. What I said is, curricula or studies or syllabus, is only for the Eleventh Standard. This Board is given only for the Eleventh Standard and for lower standards 8,9,10, that is with the Department. This is a sort of diarchy which the Government of Mysore is not willing to have.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—That is exactly what I wished to say about it. The old Board worked on a sort of diarchical system—with regard to Eleventh Standard it was with the Board and with regard to other standards, the studies were guided and controlled by the Department. With the experience gained since the passing of that Bombay Act, with the wisdom they have gained by experience, they have now passed a comprehensive Act in Bombay which we got last week, which is very comprehensive in nature. In that Act it is stated, the power of the Board is also to prescribe studies and also priscribe standards, prescribe text-books and prescribe curricula and studies for the different types of courses and examinations. Sir, the idea is this: Instead of the Board being just a board to hold examinations for whatever courses that ars priscribed, whatever subjects that are determined for whatever books that are set for the examination--instead of doing these things in a haphazard way. let there be one single organisation to think about it and organising the whole thing in a system, whether prescribing it from the beginning to the end, first prescribe syllabus, then the mode of examinations, then examination, then the distribution of certificates--all these are chain-reaction in the whole system. Therefore Sir, we will by enlarging the scope of this Board, be doing nothing against the interests of educational system or against anything that is for the benefit of the Students. Therefore Sir, by enlarging the scope o t s Board, we will be doing much better job by spending this money and we will achieve much more than what we would otherwise get by having too many boards and all that. In view of that, it is not a matter of prestige, it is not a matter for decision to be taken by a vote of this House, but it is a matter which the Hon'ble Education Minister will have to seriously think. If he things that there is some substance in what we say, and in what the Maharashtra Government is doing and in the several expert reports that we have also gone through,--if the cumulative wisdom of all this has any weight on the Education Minister, he should accept this amendment.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, the object of the amendment of this clause is to have something which is very essential for holding the examinations. Now, out of the so many responsibilities that the education Department wants to do away, it is giving away only one liability that is holding examinations. Apart from this, there are many other activities, fos instance deciding or determining the sillabus on various subjects, and then framing the curricula and prescribing text-books and

(SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI)

getting text books written by the Department. These are all the activities of the Education Department which he wants to retain with the Government. That is not at all a good feature of the Education Department's activity. Because in every other State, the department must manage only the secondary course or the secendary schools and do away with all the powers of writing textbooks, prescribing textbooks, framing curricula and syllabus and etc. All these things should be entrusted to independent bodies. That is the main conception even in the Maharashtra Act. Nowhere in India have I come across any such legislation except in Maharashtra and that is said to be the basis for bringing in such a legislation. As I have already said this Bill is entirely based on the conception and on the model of Maharashtra Act of 1948. But the Maharashtra Government itself has enacted another legislation in 1965, on 13th September 1965, in which they have completely taken away the powers of the Education Department for framing the syllabus and curriculum and then laying down subjects and prescribing text books and getting text books written by a separate body. They have placed all these activities under the pewers of a separate Board. So, here, the Hon'ble Minister for Education has followed an out-dated legislation of the Maharashtra Government, which has been replaced dy another Act by the Maharashtra Government recently. Now let me read section 18(c) of the Maharashtra Act which lays down general principles for recommending Text Books lay down to guiding principles for curricula and syllabus and for the entire secondary course, not only the course for the final examination, but for the secondary course. So this covers the whole secondary course. They have already constituted an expert body in which there arepeople with academic qualifications, people with administrative experience and people who are experts. All these people are there. They can constitute committees and sub-committees of the Board and they can independently think of these things. Here, what the Hon'ble Minister wants to do is, he wants to retain the power of writing text books and that should come for his sanction. He retains the power for fixing the syllabus, etc. These are things which are not good omen for the Education Department. He should not burden himself with all these responsibilities. Instead, if he hands over these powers to an independent body like the Secondary Board. Therefore an independent board will have the work of prescribing the text books, laying down syllabus etc. If the Minister had kept in mind the Maharashtra Act of 1948, his office, or the department at least should have kept him well-advised as regards the present Maharashtra Act. He should divest himself of all these powers and entrust the same to an independent Board as is the case in Maharashtra. Why should he not do it is the question I ask. Laying down the syllabus it should be by an independent body. It is ridiculous for them not to know in what subjects certificates should be issued. If we go on legislating on such matters, I think nobody would envy us.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I am not accepting the amendment. I have already explained about the power exercised by the SSC Board and that which is exercised by the Director of Public Instruction in Maharashtra. Hon'ble Members forget one main fact, that the SSC Board in Bombay is empowered to examine SSC examinations only and nothing else.

(*Interruption*)

Now when we are handing over all the examinations which are being examined by the Director of Public Instruction, one by one, it will be a huge thing for them and it may not be possible for this board to go into the question of curriculam and the prescribing text books, etc. My Hon'ble friend thinks that I have more power. If he comes to me, I will show him that I have divested myself of many of the powers and handed over to different bodies. In many cases, I am a Minister signing only on the dotted line. I am sorry I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the amendment of Sri Suryanarayana Rao. The question is:

"That at page 24, in sub-clause (2), the following shall be added as item (*a*) and other items shall be re-lettered suitably.

'(*a*) prescribe the courses of study, the curricula for examination and the system and standards of examinations'."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the amendment of Sri Anna Rao. The question is:

"That at page 24, in sub-clause (2) the following shall be added as item (*a*) and other items shall be re-lettered suitably:

(*a*) subjects and curricula of examinations '.

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the clause.

The question is:

"That clause 26, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 26 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSES 27 TO 41.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, I will put the remaining clauses.

The question is:

"That clauses 27 to 41, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

(Clause 27 to 41, both inclusive, were added to the Bill).

THE SCHEDULE.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Schedule stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

(The Schedule was added to the Bill)

CLAUSE 1 ETC.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, there are two amendments to the preamble. Is Sri Anna Rao, keen on knowing what the position of this is?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—I do not want to move, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then, Sri Suryanarayana Rao is absent. Both the amendments are not moved. The question is:

"That clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

(Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.)

11-00 a.m.

Motion to Pass

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, before we go to the third reading, I will have to point out an error. In clause 22 instead of: reading as:

"consisting of the members of the Board appoint such other committees"

it should appear as:

"appoint such other committees consisting of the members of the Board."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now I understand it makes a correct reading.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I understand that printed correction list also has been issued.

I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Secondary Education Examination Board Bill, 1966, as reported by the Joint Select Committee and as amended be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Secondary Education Examination Board Bill, 1966, as reported by the Joint Select Committee and as amended be passed."

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Sir, you promised to give us an opportunity. The amendments that we have moved are though very simply, have far reaching affects in the sense, take for example clause 17. I have asked for the inclusion of words "by ratification". Clause 17 deals with powers of the Chairman. In sub-clause 3 after the Chairman takes action what does he do? The Education Minister, if I have heard him correctly, said that Board has powers. If I read the clause, we can know that the Board has no powers except to give approval for whatever is done. Supposing the words "by ratification" are there, it empowers the Chairman to act in an emergency, to take action when it calls for and when the Board cannot be consulted, he can place it before the committee for ratification. Likewise the other important point that I wish to submit is about the appointment of the Board of Examiners. Even there the Chairman may appoint an examiner and report such appointments to the Board We are constituting a Board, an autonomous board, give it funds and still we do not give it the powers to decide. The Board has no opportunity to revise the panel that is submitted or to ratify what the Chairman does. The Chairman becomes a dictator and he may say that he is not bound to submit for the approval. Therefore even with regard to the very constitution of the Board it goes to the very root of it. Otherwise it just becomes an advisory body. Therefore I wish an amendment is accepted to enable the Board to function effectively whether it is for examination or anything else, so that the examinations are conducted proper by, proper persons are selected for the Board of Examiners and proper methods are evolved to avoid leakages that we have been experienced in provious years and such cases may not be repeated. I only wish the Education Minister to view these things in proper light and see the reasonableness of the suggestions and accept the amendments moved.

So far as clause 20 (1) is concerned, the amendment is improtenent. What I mean is salary and allowances of the staff of the Board should not be made to be drawn from out of the consolidated fund but allowed to be drawn from out of its own fund because such a thing would give status and some authority over its subordinate staff. Of course in clause (2) there is provision for contributions from the Board and it is bound to be there because of the persons who are deputed to this Board. Their allowances, pensionary contributions, etc., have to be met out of the consolidated fund. It is all right. If salary is also to be paid out of it, why should it be so? Let it be paid out of the funds of the Board itself and let the contribution, pensionary contribution, allowances etc. of officials deputed to the Board be paid out of the consolidated fund. Therefore, if the Board is not empowered to have its own control over its employees, then the pwowers of the Board is so much watered down.

†SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, here is a Board, which according to Clause 21 draws the Panel of Examiners and out of this Panel the Chairman makes appointments of Examiners. That is the whole conception of it. The Chairman of the Board, by chance, happens

(SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI)

to be the Chairman of the Examiners' Committee. The whole conception of the Consitution of this Secondary Education Examination Board hinges upon Clause 4, that is to say, the appointment of Examiners, those who set the papers, those who valu the paper and those who act of Invigilators. All these people are included in this and for the appointment of these people, one man, *i.e.*, the Chairman of the Examiners' Committee, has been given optional power to choose anybody in the list and to appoint as Examiner. Is this the kind of legislation by which this body is going to give power to one single person ? is it desirable, without giving any direction to the Chairman to follow the list in the order of priority or something of the sort ? Without giving any direction, should we give ample powers to appoint anybody in the Panel ? This kind of discretion cannot be given, and I think it is against the spirit of the Constitution. Such powers cannot be given to one person. The whole thing centres upon the Chairman of the Board, who will appoint all kinds of examiners; he is the sole authority to appoint Examiners. If the list of persons consists of thousand examiners, he can appoint anybody, any number of times and the same person can be appointed for any subject.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir. the Hon'ble Member.....

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, I am not yielding.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, the Hon'ble member is a member of the Select Committee and all these matters have been discussed.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, I am not yielding. When the members on the other Side do not yield, you call us to order. But, what is the treatment you are giving to me ? When I say I am not yielding, what is the use of .....

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I rise to a point of Order. Can a member, who was a member of the Joint Select Committee raise questions on which there was detailed discussion and it was understood that this is provided by the by-law and regulations ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Whenever a Point of Order is raised, reference to the Rules must be made.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The right of the Hon'ble member to raised questions which have been discussed in the Joint Select Committee.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, you hane been pleased to hold on several occasions that a member, who is a member of the Select Committee, if he gives a minute of dissent he is entitled make observations on the scope of the Bill.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I agree. But the Hon'ble member must know that this has been agreed to by the Joint Select Committee.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—If he has not agreed there and a decision is taken, he is entitled to canves the same point here. Sir, you have held that such a member is entitled to make observations provided he has given a dissenting note.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I propose to devote the ensuing two holidays for the study of the important points raised.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—I should not refer here to what took place in the Select Committee; it is not proper. I have given my dissenting note and I have said that the appointing authority should not be the Chairman, but the Board. If this is read with clause 23, then think, the whole meaning will be rendred clear. Clause 23 says:

> "TERMINATION OF EXAMINERS' APPOINTMENT FOR MISCONDUCT OR NEGLIGENCE.—(1) Is at any time it appears to the Board that a person appointed as an Examiner under this Act, has been guilty of misconduct or negligence, which renders his appointment as an Examiner inexpedient, the Board may make an order terminating his appointment and ....."

When the Board has not appointed any person, how can it remove him? I do not know how well advised the Minister was. Apart from this, I should say, one person should not be given the authority without any directions to him, as to how he should use his discretion, how he should select persons, which person should be the proper person and whether he must be well versed in a practicular subject or not. All these things should not be left to the Chairman. There is nothing here which says that he will make appointments in the prescribed manner. Also, there is no authority for the Government to make rules and regulations. Under what power the Government can make any rule? So, I should say that this is an obsolete cause. We cannot entrust powers to one single person. He can appoint a person for hundred subjects and he may not touch any other person. Such absolute power to one single person cannot be given. That is my submission.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—There is inconsistency with regard to clauses 21 and 23. As you are aware, under the Government of India Act 1935, there are several cases.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Suppose there is consistency?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The powers of the Board have been very well defined.

†Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Several cases you might have come across where a person cannot be dismissed by any person who has not appointed him. Clause 23 proceeds on the assumption that all the examiners should be appointed by the Board. Unfortunately, clause 21 makes a provision that the Chairman will appoint them. These two clauses are inconsistent. If there is specific provision in 23 that this Board can also dismiss such officers appointed by the Chairman, then I can understand.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, hon'ble Members are under some misapprehension. I refer to clause 15—powers and duties of the Board. The powers of appointment are with the Board. It may be of the official staff or of the Supervisors or Examiners, etc. The power that is given

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

to the Chairman is, in an emergency, he can make temporary appointments. The Chairman shall make a report at the meeting. He makes an appointment for a temporary period and that has to be reported to the Board. The Board can take such action as it likes. The appointment may not be rectified by the Board but they may say : what has been done is wrong and the man should go out. When a temporary appointment is made, the Board may say 'no.' There is nothing wrong in that.

Sir, I will go to another point raised about the Panel. The Panel consists of certain number of names. The Joint Select Committee also felt that there will be a priority list. It could be regulated either by regulation or by by-laws. When this is done, I am sure, hon'ble members will not have any chance to grumble against the Chairman because he is bound by the priority given in the list. So, what happens is, the Board, if it makes an appointment of an examiner —say X —the examiner may not be willing to accept it. So, the Board gives the power to the Chairman after making a list of priority. This power is given to the Examiners' Committee under clause 15, because it is over-riding power of the Board to make appointments of examiners, supervisors, etc. So, the power which has been given explicitly in clause 15 and 19, so that there will be no misuse of this power by the Chairman. This Committee is a Committee consisting of the Members of the Board.

†SRI S. SIVAPPA.—The Panel does not come before the Board. The Panel suggested by the Examiner's Committee does not go before the Board for approval. The Chairman can do anything. Then, why should you have a Board at all ? What is the purpose ?

SRI K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Sir, one word more if you permit.

MR. SPEAKER.—No, I am sorry. The question is :

"That the Mysore Secondary Education Examination Board Bill, 1966, as reported by the Joint Select Committee and as amended be passed."

The motion was adopted.

11-30 A.M.

MYSORE ENTERTAINMENT TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966.

Motion to consider.

SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—(Minister for Finance).—I be to move:

"That the Mysore Entertainment Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1966 be taken into consideration."